

Automation in Dairy and Livestock Farm Management

Khawale Ashutosh Vijay^{*1} and Chaple Pooja M²

¹Assistant Professor, MJF College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Chomu, Jaipur; MVSc, NET; Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izzatnagar, Bareilly

²Assistant Professor, Arawali Veterinary College, Bajor, Sikar, Rajasthan; MVSc, DUVASU, Mathura

*Corresponding Author Email: ashutoshkhawale2@gmail.com

Abstract

Automation is becoming an important component of dairy and livestock farm management because it can perform repetitive tasks consistently while generating detailed information on individual animals. Automated milking systems, electronic identification, robotic feed delivery, activity sensors, milk analysers, climate controllers and manure-handling equipment are examples of technologies now used in commercial production. Their value extends beyond labour saving. Continuous records can help detect changes in milk yield, feed intake, rumination, movement, body weight, estrus and health before a problem becomes obvious. Automation can also improve the consistency of feeding and milking routines and reduce human exposure to physically demanding tasks. However, successful automation requires reliable electricity, maintenance, calibration, staff training and clear procedures for responding to alerts. Poor-quality data or badly designed alarm thresholds can create false confidence or excessive alerts. Farms should therefore select technology according to a defined management problem rather than simply adopting the newest equipment. Economic evaluation should include purchase cost, service, replacement parts, labour changes, productivity and animal health. When well-integrated with good husbandry and veterinary care, automation can improve efficiency, welfare and decision making while allowing workers to focus more attention on animals that need human judgement.

Keywords: Farm Automation, Dairy Technology, Precision Livestock, Robotic Milking, Sensors, Livestock Management

How to Cite this article: Khawale, A. V., & Chaple, P. M. (2026). Automation in Dairy and Livestock Farm Management. *Future Agriculture e-magazine*, September 2026, Issue 3, pp. 250-257.

Introduction

Livestock farms contain many repetitive processes: milking, feeding, manure removal, heat detection, weighing and environmental control. Automation can perform some of these tasks with greater frequency and consistency than manual routines. At the same time, sensors create a digital record of what is happening to individual animals and groups. Practical implementation of introduction should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For dairy and livestock farm automation, priority should be given to linking repetitive tasks with reliable animal-level data, clear labour goals and defined management decisions. A practical plan is to map the existing workflow before selecting equipment, identify bottlenecks and decide which tasks benefit from

automation without removing essential human observation. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include task completion time, animal exceptions, labour hours, equipment uptime, production consistency and health alerts. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that automation can hide poor routines when staff assume that a machine is correct merely because it is automatic. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour,

infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

The purpose of automation should be clearly defined. Labour saving is important, but many systems are justified by improved consistency, earlier detection or better use of information. A machine does not correct poor housing, nutrition or stockmanship, so technology must be added to a sound management system. The value of introduction also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect linking repetitive tasks with reliable animal-level data, clear labour goals and defined management decisions with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for task completion time, animal exceptions, labour hours, equipment uptime, production consistency and health alerts. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because automation can hide poor routines when staff assume that a machine is correct merely because it is automatic, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Automated Milking Systems

Robotic milking allows cows to enter a milking unit voluntarily, where identification, teat preparation and milking are performed automatically. The system records milk yield, milking interval and selected milk characteristics. This can reduce fixed milking schedules and provide detailed cow-level data. Practical implementation of automated milking systems should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For dairy and livestock farm automation, priority should be given to cow traffic, milking frequency, teat preparation, milk-quality monitoring and rapid

identification of cows that do not visit the unit. A practical plan is to design access lanes and resting areas so cows can move voluntarily, train animals gradually and maintain attachment, cleaning and milk-sensing components on schedule. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include milking interval, visits per cow, failed attachments, milk yield, conductivity or other milk-quality indicators, fetch-cow numbers and udder-health events. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that robotic milking can increase data volume while still missing disease or welfare problems that require direct examination. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.



Successful robotic milking depends on barn layout, cow traffic, hoof health and ration design. Animals that do not visit the robot may require fetching, and poor udder conformation can affect attachment. Hygiene and equipment maintenance remain essential for milk quality. The value of automated milking systems also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect cow traffic, milking frequency, teat preparation, milk-quality monitoring and rapid

identification of cows that do not visit the unit with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for milking interval, visits per cow, failed attachments, milk yield, conductivity or other milk-quality indicators, fetch-cow numbers and udder-health events. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because robotic milking can increase data volume while still missing disease or welfare problems that require direct examination, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Automated Feeding and Feed Management

Automatic mixers, feed kitchens and robotic pushers can deliver feed more frequently and reduce variation caused by manual loading. Electronic concentrate feeders can allocate supplements according to individual production or physiological stage. Practical implementation of automated feeding and feed management should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For dairy and livestock farm automation, priority should be given to accurate ingredient loading, ration consistency, frequent feed access and individual or group allocation of supplements. A practical plan is to calibrate mixer scales and feeders, verify dry matter, inspect feed distribution and maintain backup procedures for power or mechanical failure. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include loading error, refusals, feed-bunk availability, eating visits, milk or growth response, body condition and feed efficiency. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter

expected performance. One limitation is that precise delivery cannot compensate for poor forage quality, inadequate bunk space or a badly formulated ration. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.



Automation should verify ingredient weights and dry matter because an accurately programmed machine can still deliver the wrong ration if feed composition has changed. Bunk inspection and animal observation remain necessary to detect sorting, refusal or competition. The value of automated feeding and feed management also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect accurate ingredient loading, ration consistency, frequent feed access and individual or group allocation of supplements with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for loading error, refusals, feed-bunk availability, eating visits, milk or growth response, body condition and feed efficiency. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because precise delivery cannot compensate for poor forage quality, inadequate bunk space or a badly formulated ration, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints.

Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Table 1. Common automation technologies in livestock farms.

Technology	Management function
Robotic milking	Milking, individual yield records and selected milk-quality or health indicators.
Automatic feeders	Controlled feed delivery and intake or visit recording.
Activity/rumination sensors	Estrus detection and early warning of health or behavioural change.
Climate controllers	Automatic operation of fans, curtains, sprinklers or ventilation.
Automated manure systems	Frequent scraping or collection with reduced manual labour.
Farm management software	Combines production, health and reproduction records for decisions.

Health and Behaviour Sensors

Activity collars, ear tags, pedometers and rumination sensors can identify deviations from normal behaviour. Reduced activity may indicate illness or lameness, while increased activity can support estrus detection. Thermal sensors and cameras are also being studied for early health monitoring. Practical implementation of health and behaviour sensors should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For dairy and livestock farm automation, priority should be given to using activity, rumination, temperature, location and production changes as early-warning signals rather than automatic diagnoses. A practical plan is to establish a normal baseline for each group, set practical alert thresholds and require staff to confirm alerts through animal observation and clinical evaluation. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include alert frequency, confirmation rate, false positives, missed cases, rumination trends, activity changes and time from alert to examination. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that too many low-value alarms create alert fatigue and can reduce confidence in genuinely important warnings. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations

checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

Alerts should be prioritised. A system that generates too many false positives can be ignored by workers. Combining multiple signals, such as activity, rumination and milk yield, often provides more useful information than a single measurement. The value of health and behaviour sensors also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect using activity, rumination, temperature, location and production changes as early-warning signals rather than automatic diagnoses with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for alert frequency, confirmation rate, false positives, missed cases, rumination trends, activity changes and time from alert to examination. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because too many low-value alarms create alert fatigue and can reduce confidence in genuinely important warnings, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Reproduction and Young-Stock Automation

Automated heat detection can improve the timing of insemination, particularly in large herds where continuous visual observation is difficult. Integration with breeding records allows animals to be flagged for pregnancy diagnosis or reproductive examination. Practical implementation of reproduction and young-stock automation should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For dairy and livestock farm automation, priority should be given to

improving heat detection, calving surveillance, calf feeding consistency and growth monitoring. A practical plan is to combine activity or calving alerts with breeding records, maintain calf-feeder hygiene and use individual identification so abnormal intake or growth can be investigated promptly. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include heat-detection rate, conception, calving alerts, calf meal size, missed visits, growth rate, illness and mortality. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that devices may detect behavioural change without identifying the underlying reproductive, nutritional or infectious cause. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

Automatic calf feeders can deliver controlled milk meals and record drinking behaviour. A fall in intake or drinking speed can identify calves that need closer examination. The equipment must be cleaned carefully because milk residues can support bacterial growth. The value of reproduction and young-stock automation also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect improving heat detection, calving surveillance, calf feeding consistency and growth monitoring with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for heat-detection rate, conception, calving alerts, calf meal size, missed visits, growth rate, illness and mortality. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because devices may detect behavioural change without identifying the underlying reproductive, nutritional or infectious cause, weak results should first prompt a review of

implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Environmental and Manure Automation

Fans, curtains, sprinklers and ventilation controllers can respond to temperature and humidity. Automated systems are useful because heat stress can develop rapidly, but sensors should be positioned where they reflect the animal environment rather than only outdoor weather. Practical implementation of environmental and manure automation should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For dairy and livestock farm automation, priority should be given to maintaining stable temperature, ventilation, cooling, lighting and manure-removal routines while reducing hazardous manual work. A practical plan is to use environmental sensors to control fans or sprinklers within defined limits and schedule scraper or pump maintenance before heavy-use periods. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include temperature-humidity conditions, fan or pump runtime, bedding moisture, air quality, manure removal frequency and animal heat-stress indicators. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that sensor or actuator failure during extreme weather can rapidly become a welfare problem if no manual backup exists. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

Scrapers, flushing systems and robotic manure collectors reduce manual labour and help maintain cleaner walking surfaces. Manure storage and treatment must still be managed to prevent nutrient loss, gas hazards and water pollution. The value of environmental and manure automation also depends on integration

with the wider production system. Management should connect maintaining stable temperature, ventilation, cooling, lighting and manure-removal routines while reducing hazardous manual work with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for temperature-humidity conditions, fan or pump runtime, bedding moisture, air quality, manure removal frequency and animal heat-stress indicators. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because sensor or actuator failure during extreme weather can rapidly become a welfare problem if no manual backup exists, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Table 2. Steps for responsible automation adoption.

Step	Key question
Define the problem	Which labour, health, consistency or data issue must the technology solve?
Check infrastructure	Are electricity, internet, housing and equipment space adequate?
Evaluate economics	Do purchase, service and replacement costs match expected benefits?
Train staff	Who will maintain equipment, review alerts and act on abnormal data?
Pilot and calibrate	Does the system perform accurately under local farm conditions?
Maintain backup plans	How will animals be milked, fed, cooled or monitored during failure?

Data Integration and Decision Support

The greatest potential benefit occurs when data from milking, feeding, reproduction and health systems can be viewed together. A cow with declining milk, rumination and activity deserves different attention from an animal with a single minor change. Practical implementation of data integration and decision support should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For dairy and livestock farm automation, priority should be given to combining information from milking, feeding, reproduction, health and environment

into a manageable set of farm decisions. A practical plan is to standardise animal identification, check time stamps and data quality, define who reviews dashboards and link each important alert to an action protocol. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include data completeness, agreement between systems, response time, repeat alerts, resolution of exceptions and changes in key herd performance indicators. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that more data do not necessarily improve decisions when records are inconsistent, poorly labelled or disconnected from farm routines. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

Interoperability remains a challenge because farm systems may use different software and data formats. Farms should plan how records will be backed up, who can access them and how long they will be retained. The value of data integration and decision support also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect combining information from milking, feeding, reproduction, health and environment into a manageable set of farm decisions with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for data completeness, agreement between systems, response time, repeat alerts, resolution of exceptions and changes in key herd performance indicators. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because more data do not necessarily improve decisions when records are inconsistent, poorly labelled or disconnected from farm routines, weak results should first

prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Economics, Labour and Maintenance

Automation changes labour rather than eliminating it. Time spent on repetitive work may decline, while technical maintenance, data review and attention to exception animals increase. Staff need training in both equipment operation and animal observation. Practical implementation of economics, labour and maintenance should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For dairy and livestock farm automation, priority should be given to evaluating whether automation solves a real constraint after accounting for capital, service, training and downtime. A practical plan is to calculate total cost of ownership, plan preventive maintenance, train more than one worker and maintain access to spare parts and technical support. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include labour hours, repair cost, downtime, productivity changes, culling, animal-health outcomes, energy use and payback period. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that labour savings can be overstated when time is simply shifted from physical work to fetching animals, cleaning sensors, troubleshooting or managing data. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

Investment should be evaluated with realistic assumptions about herd size, labour cost, service contracts, electricity and expected productivity. Backup plans are critical because failure of a milking, feeding or ventilation system can quickly become an animal-welfare

emergency. The value of economics, labour and maintenance also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect evaluating whether automation solves a real constraint after accounting for capital, service, training and downtime with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for labour hours, repair cost, downtime, productivity changes, culling, animal-health outcomes, energy use and payback period. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because labour savings can be overstated when time is simply shifted from physical work to fetching animals, cleaning sensors, troubleshooting or managing data, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Conclusion

Automation can improve consistency and provide continuous information that supports better dairy and livestock management. Robotic milking, automated feeding, sensors and environmental controls are most valuable when they solve a defined farm problem and when workers respond appropriately to the data generated.

Technology should complement stockmanship. Regular calibration, maintenance, staff training and animal observation are essential to convert automation from expensive equipment into a practical management advantage.

References

- Berckmans, D. (2017). General introduction to precision livestock farming. *Animal Frontiers*, 7(1), 6-11.
- Banhazi, T. M., Babinszky, L., Halas, V., & Tschärke, M. (2012). Precision livestock farming: Precision feeding technologies and sustainable livestock production. *International Journal of Agricultural and Biological Engineering*, 5(4), 54-61.



- Jacobs, J. A., & Siegford, J. M. (2012). The impact of automatic milking systems on dairy cow management, behavior, health, and welfare. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 95, 2227-2247.
- Neethirajan, S. (2017). Recent advances in wearable sensors for animal health management. *Sensing and Bio-Sensing Research*, 12, 15-29.
- Rutten, C. J., Velthuis, A. G. J., Steeneveld, W., & Hogeveen, H. (2013). Sensors to support health management on dairy farms. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 96, 1928-1952.
- Wolfert, S., Ge, L., Verdouw, C., & Bogaardt, M.-J. (2017). Big Data in Smart Farming. *Agricultural Systems*, 153, 69-80.